

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations  
and is not a part of the Official Record

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,  
please do not report the images to the  
Image Problem Mailbox.**



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/768,037	01/22/2001	John F. Croix	SILI:004US	2676

7590 06/25/2004

John J. Bruckner  
FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI, LLP  
Suite 2400  
600 Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701

EXAMINER
----------

STEVENS, THOMAS H

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2123

DATE MAILED: 06/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/768,037	CROIX, JOHN F.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Thomas H. Stevens	2123	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-50 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 22 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)               | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-50 were examined.

#### *Title*

2. The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed. The following title is suggested: "An interactive method and apparatus of a plurality of software programs for electronic modeling and simulation".

#### *Drawings*

3. The informal drawings are not of sufficient quality to permit examination (e.g., figure 5 is unreadable). Accordingly, new drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

#### *Information Disclosure Statement*

4. The information disclosure statement filed January 22 2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c). It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

#### *Claim Interpretation*

5. Office personnel are to give claims their "**broadest reasonable interpretation**" in light of the supporting disclosure. *In re Morris*, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d

1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. *In re Prater*, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550-551 (CCPA 1969). See \*also *In re Zletz*, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow") .... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed .... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process. **The examiner interprets the following features from the specification:**

- ❑ **First programs—electronic design.**
- ❑ **Second programs—dynamic link library.**
- ❑ **Third programs—software micros related to the electronic design.**
- ❑ **Forth programs—one or more active models and algorithmic content.**

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

7. Claim 15 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claims contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. The examiner is unclear as to who is conducting the query for determining a next action (specification: pg.23/25, lines 12-13)

8. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

9. Regarding claim 48, the word, "adapted" renders the claim indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitation following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

10. Claims 25 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The "first and second set of functions" stated in the claims is vague and indefinite.

11. Claims 39 and 45, the phrase "translatable" is unclear in the context of the claim; but the examiner interprets the scope of claims 39 and 45 as redundant to claim 42.

12. Furthermore, claim 7, the phrase, "specific shared objects" and claims 29 and 42 the word "associated" renders these claims indefinite because it is unclear whether the limitations following the phrase are part of the claimed invention. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

13. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

14. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

15. Claims 1-50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Deans (U.S. Patent 6,341,368 (1997)) in view of Dewey ("Digital and Analog Electronic Design Automation" Duke University (1999)).

Deans teaches a pre-processor to create multi-instantiated code from a single instance so that multiple copies of the single instance code can be run without changing the source code of the single instance code (abstract: lines 1-4). Although Deans teaches aspects that couple said invention (e.g., dynamic link libraries (column 1, lines 35-42)); his invention, with regard to these libraries, is not application specific. Dewey teaches an overview of electronic design automation through intricate and detail process of an electronic circuit from design to market.

At the time the invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Deans to modify Dewey since it would have been advantageous for a semiconductor manufacturing facility to own and update circuit "DNA" or library for reference purposes throughout the design, simulation and quality control process.

Claim 1. A method, comprising: providing an interface for communication between a set of (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50) first programs and a second program; and providing to the second program at least one of a set of third programs associated with at least one of the set of first programs, in response to a dataset associated with said at least one of the set of first programs, wherein the at least one of the set of third programs selectively modifies the interface for communication between the second program and said at least one of the set of first programs (Deans: column 1, lines 29-50 and figure 6 with column 5, lines 19-22).



Claim 2. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein providing to the second program includes: loading in the second program by one of the set of first programs; and loading in at least one of the set of third programs by the second program for tuning the response of said second program to the at least one of the set of first programs (Deans: column 5, lines 13-22).

Claim 3. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein providing to the second program includes loading in a fourth program by the second program for serving the at least one of the set of first programs (Dewey: pg.5, lines 1-17 and Deans: column 5, lines 13-22).

Claim 4. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the set of first programs includes a set of application programs for electronic design automation.

Claim 5. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the second program includes a shared object having a generic code for use with the set of first programs (Dewey: pg.2, lines 12-16).

Claim 6. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the second program includes a dynamic link library having a plurality of generic macros for use with the set of first programs (Deans: column 5, lines 39-47).

Claim 7. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the set of third programs includes a plurality of application specific shared objects, each application specific shared object having one or more application specific macros associated with the at least one of set of first programs (Deans: column 5, lines 39-47 and Dewey: pg.2, lines 12-16).

Claim 8. The method of Claim 1(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the set of third programs includes a plurality of application specific dynamic link libraries, each application specific dynamic link library having one or more application specific macros associated with one or more of set of first programs (Deans: column 5, lines 39-47 and Dewey: pg.2, lines 12-16).

Claim 9. The method of Claim 3(Dewey: pg.5, lines 1-17 and Deans: column 5, lines 13-22), wherein the fourth program includes one or more active models, each active model having a dataset and an algorithmic content, the forth program being shared by the set of first programs (Dewey: pg.5, lines 15-17, pg.6, lines 1-34).

Claim 10. The method of Claim 9(Dewey: pg.5, lines 1-17 and Deans: column 5, lines 13-22), wherein the at least one of the set of first programs communicates with the fourth program through the second program while utilizing the at least one of the set of third programs (Dewey: pg.5, lines 15-17, pg.6, lines 1-34).

Claim 11. The method of Claim 9 (Dewey: pg. 5, lines 1-17 and Deans: column 5, lines 13-22), wherein the at least one of the set of first programs communicates directly with the fourth program while utilizing the at least one of the set of third programs (Dewey: pg. 5, lines 15-17, pg. 6, lines 1-34).

Claim 12. The method of Claim 1 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein providing includes: making a call having the dataset from the at least one of the set of first programs to the second program; and directing the call to a selected one of the set of third programs responsive to a first determination from the dataset.

Claim 13. The method of Claim 12 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), monitored parameters and a second set of one or more operational parameters (Dewey: pg. 2, lines 12-16).

Claim 14. The method of Claim 13, wherein the first determination includes checking the dataset for at least one monitored parameter from the first set of one or more monitored parameters wherein the dataset includes a first set of one or more monitored parameters (Dewey: pg. 2, lines 12-16 and Deans: column 5, lines 39-47 and figure 1B with column 2, lines 27-44).

Claim 15. The method of Claim 14(Dewey: pg. 2, lines 12-16 and Deans: column 5, lines 39-47 and figure 1B with column 2, lines 27-44), wherein checking includes: performing a first set of actions responsive to presence of the at least one monitored performing parameter; and performing a second set of actions responsive to absence of the at least one monitored parameter (Dewey: pg.2, lines 1-11).

Claim 16. The method of Claim 15(Dewey: pg. 2, lines 1-11, 12-16 and Deans: column 5, lines 39-47 and figure 1B with column 2, lines 27-44), wherein performing the first set of actions includes responding to the at least one of the first set of first programs with a query for determining a next action (Deans: column 5, lines 35-37).

Claim 17. The method of Claim 15(Dewey: pg. 2, lines 1-11, 12-16 and Deans: column 5, lines 35-37, 39-47 and figure 1B with column 2, lines 27-44), wherein performing the second set of actions includes optimizing a sequence of calls (Deans: column 1, lines 29-49; and Dewey: pg. 6, lines 1-7) as a function of the dataset associated with the at least one of the first set of first programs.

Claim 18. The method of Claim 12(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein providing includes making a callback from the at least one of the set of third programs to the at least one of the set of first programs for determining a response to the call (Deans: column 5, lines 39-47).

Art Unit: 2123

Claim 19. The method of Claim 1 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein providing includes: making a call having the dataset from the at least one of the set of first programs to the second program (Deans: column 5, lines 39-47); and responding to the at least one of the set of first programs responsive to a second determination from the dataset (Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 20. A method for using a set of first programs with a second program, comprising (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50): providing an application procedural interface for communication (Deans: figure 1 and column 2, lines 25-30; and Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction) between the set of first programs and the second program; and providing, through the use of the application procedural interface, to the second programs at least one of a set of plug-ins from a database responsive to a dataset identified to be associated with said at least one of the set of first programs (Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 21. The method of Claim 20, wherein providing includes identifying said at least one of the set of first programs to the second program by analyzing the dataset with the second program (Deans: column 1, lines 29-50 and Dewey: pgs. 4 and 5—netlist and silicon compilers).

Claim 22. The method of Claim 20 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50, column 5, lines 15-22, 39-47), further comprising, before providing said

application procedural interface, creating said at least one of a set of the plug-ins for supporting operation of the second program with said at least one of the sets of first programs.

Claim 23. The method of Claim 20(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction with pg.5 lines 15-17 and pg. 6, lines 1-34; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50, column 5, lines 15-22, 39-47), wherein the second program includes an active dynamic library including one or more active models, each of said one or more active models having an associated data and algorithmic content.

Claim 24. The method of Claim 20(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the set of first programs includes a plurality of application programs deployed in a design flow of an integrated circuit (Dewey: pg. 2, lines 12-16).

Claim 25. The method of Claim 20 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein the application procedural interface includes: a first set of functions having a first number of fields to pass a first set of one or more parameters for the set of first programs; and a second set of functions having a second set of fields to pass a second set of one or more parameters for the second program (Deans: column 5, lines 23-38 and figure 7 and lines 39-47).

Claim 26. The method of Claim 25(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50;column 5, lines 23-38 and figure 7 and lines 39-47), wherein each of said first set of functions includes a call.

Claim 27. The method of Claim 25, wherein each of said second set of functions includes a callback (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50;column 5, lines 23-38 and figure 7 and lines 39-47).

Claim 28. A system, comprising: an interface to communicate between a set of first programs and a second program; and a set of third programs, wherein one of the set of first programs loads in the second program and the second program, responsive to a dataset from one of the set of first programs, loads in at least one of the set of third programs (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50;column 5, lines 23-38 and figure 7 and lines 39-47).

Claim 29. The system of Claim 28(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50;column 5, lines 23-38 and figure 7 and lines 39-47), wherein said dataset is identified to be associated with said at least one of the set of first programs.

Claim 30. The system of Claim 28(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50;column 5, lines 23-38 and figure 7 and lines 39-47), wherein said at least one of the set of third programs is a plug-in to said second program.

Claim 31. A system for using a set of first programs with a second program, comprising (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50): an application procedural interface for communication between the set of first programs and the second program (Dewey: pg. 4, lines 1-7); and a database including a set of plug-ins, wherein one of the set of first programs loads in the second program and the second program is responsive to a dataset from one of the set of first programs to load in at least one of the set of plug-ins (Deans: column 3, lines 11-24 and column 5, lines 19-46; Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction).

Claim 32. The system of Claim 31, wherein said database includes a directory having the set of plug-ins organized in a file system (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 33. The system of Claim 31 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), wherein each of said set of plug-ins includes an application personality profile for an associated one of the set of first programs, the application personality profile determines an optimized sequence of function calls between the associated one of the set of first programs and the second program, said optimized sequence responsive to the dataset (Dewey: pg. 5, lines 15-17, pg. 6, lines 1-34).

Claim 34. A system, comprising: an application procedural interface for extending a dynamic library for use with a first application program and a second application



program; a first plug-in, wherein the dynamic library loads the first plug-in responsive to the first application program; and a second plug-in, wherein the dynamic library loads the second plug-in responsive to the second application program (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 35. The system of Claim 34, wherein said first plug-in is stored in a library (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50, column 3, lines 11-24).

Claim 36. The system of Claim 35, wherein said first and second plug-ins are stored in said library (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50, column 3, lines 11-24).

Claim 37. The system of Claim 34 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50, column 3, lines 11-24), wherein said each plug-in includes: a first set of one or more parameters to be monitored (Dewey: pg.2, lines 12-16 and Deans: figure 1b (120)); a first set for at least one of the first set of one or more parameters (Dewey: pg.2, lines 12-16); a second set of one or more parameters to be processed (Dewey: pg.2, lines 12-16); a second rule for at least one of the second set of one or more parameters (Dewey: pg. 12, 4<sup>th</sup> paragraph); a first routine responsive to a set of transactions through the application procedural interface, the first routine stores information on transactions affecting one or more of the first set of one or more parameters and one or more of the second set of one or more parameters (Deans:

column 5, lines 24-37) and a second routine responsive to the first routine, the second routine invokes one of a first set of actions in response to said at least one of the first set of one or more parameters failing to comply with the first rule, and invokes one of a second set of actions in response to said at least one of the second set of one or more parameters being generated according to the second rule.

Claim 38. An electronic media, comprising a program for performing the method of Claim 1 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 39. A computer program, comprising computer or machine-readable program elements translatable for implementing the method of Claim 1 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 40. The method of Claim 1, further comprising verifying a design of an integrated circuit (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 41. An integrated circuit designed in accordance with the method of Claim 1 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 42. A computer program comprising computer program means adapted to perform the steps of providing an interface for communication between a set of first programs and a second program (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50; column 3, lines 65-67; and column 4, lines 1-14); and providing to the second program at least one of a set of third programs associated with at least one of the set of first programs responsive to a dataset identified to be associated with said at least one of the set of first programs when said at least one of the set of set of first programs is run a computer (Deans: column 1, lines 29-49; column 5, lines 39-46).

Claim 43. A computer program as medium claimed in Claim 42 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50; column 3, lines 65-67; and column 4, lines 1-14), embodied on a computer-readable medium (Deans: column 3, lines 11-24).

Claim 44. An electronic media (Deans: column 3, lines 11-24), comprising a program for performing the method of Claim 20 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 45. A computer program, comprising computer or machine-readable program (Deans: column 3, lines 11-24) elements translatable for implementing the method of Claim 20 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 46. The method of Claim 20(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), further comprising verifying a design of an integrated circuit (Dewy: pg. 7-11, Verification).

Claim 47. An integrated circuit designed in accordance with the method of Claim 20 (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50).

Claim 48. A computer program comprising computer program means adapted to perform the steps of providing an application procedural interface for communication between a set of first programs and a second program (Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50); and providing, through the use of the application procedural interface, to the second program at least one of a set of plug-ins from a database responsive to a dataset identified to be associated with said at least one of the set of first programs when said at least one of the set of first programs is run on a computer (Deans: column 1, lines 29-49; column 3, lines 65-67 and column 4, lines 1-15).

Claim 49. A computer program as claimed in Claim 48(Dewey: pg. 1, Introduction and pg. 4, lines 1-4 and pg. 2, lines 12-16; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-50), embodied on a computer-readable medium (Deans: column 3, lines 36-38).

Art Unit: 2123

Claim 50. A method for using a first program with a second program, comprising:  
communicating an indication from the first program to the second program (Deans:  
column 1, lines 29-49); analyzing the indication to determine an interaction between the  
first and second program (Deans: column 1, lines 39-49); and utilizing a third program to  
time the interaction between the first program and the second program (Dewey: pg. 7-8,  
Timing Analysis; and Deans: column 1, lines 29-49).

***Correspondence Information***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the  
examiner should be directed to Mr. Tom Stevens whose telephone number is (703) 305-  
0365, Monday-Friday (8:00 am- 4:30 pm) or contact Supervisor Mr. Kevin Teska at  
(703) 305-9704. The fax number for the group is 703-872-9306.

Any inquires of general nature or relating to the status of this application should  
be directed to the Group receptionist whose phone number is (703) 305-3900.

June 14, 2004

THS



KEVIN J. TESKA  
SUPERVISORY  
PATENT EXAMINER